

paraphrase, or pending amendment, provided this demand is recorded.

This rule was debated at some length, and finally laid upon the table.

Mr. Lyon, of New York, stated that he had yesterday voted for consigning to the Committee of the Whole the Nebraska-Kansas bill, but that his name had been omitted in the report. By general consent, the Journal was ordered to be corrected.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole, and proceeded to consider the Indian appropriation bill.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 1854.

The poem by Mary E. Hubbell, on our first page, needs to be read but once to be recommended.

FILES OF THE ERA FOR SALE.

As we have been printing a large supply of the *Era* since the commencement of the Nebraska excitement, we can furnish at the very low rates, for general circulation, files of the paper from December 1, 1853, to April 1, 1854, a period of four months, containing—

Goodell's Series on the Legal Tenure of Slavery.

Speech of Gerrit Smith on the Kossuth Correspondence.

Speech of Mr. Giddings on the Amistad Claim.

Address of the Independent Democratic Members of Congress on the Nebraska Question.

Speeches of Messrs. Chase, Seward, Sumner, and Douglas, upon the same question.

And our Editorials upon the same question, amounting to more than one hundred columns.

We will supply them at 25 cents a single file, or at \$1 for five files.

We doubt whether documents of so much value, so suitable for circulation at this crisis, could be furnished at so low a cost in any other way.

BADGER'S AMENDMENT—SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY.

Let not the opponents of the Nebraska Bill be deceived by the clamor raised by a portion of the Southern press against Badger's amendment, or that of Douglas depriving Congress of a revisionary power over Territorial legislation.

It may serve to illustrate the wonderful zeal and vigilance of certain gentlemen ambitious of notoriety, and to delude some Northern men with the notion that these amendments are signal concessions to the North, so valuable that they should disarm all opposition to the Bill.

The fact is, they concede nothing to the North, they take nothing from the South. With or without them, the Bill is an outrage on good faith, a reversal of the policy of the Union for the third of a century, a base betrayal of Northern interests, a profligate and ruinous concession to Slavery.

Messrs. Badger, Butler, and Mason, are too clear-headed not to understand the true nature and object of the Bill, and they are not the men to propose of tolerate any amendments that would impair its efficiency. The design of it is, to repeal an act which discriminates so far between Liberty and Slavery as to imply national disapprobation of the latter; to open the whole of the unorganized territory of the Union to the curse of slave labor; to secure to slaveholders facilities for maintaining and augmenting their political ascendancy; to establish a principle, in virtue of which all future territorial acquisitions may incur to their special benefit, and to repeal the act on a ground which will supersede and virtually annul whatever restriction to slavery may have been imposed by Congress in the Constitutions of Oregon, Minnesota, Washington, and Texas. This design is completely covered by the Bill, in its present shape. Badger's amendment, and the absence of a provision securing to Congress a revisionary power over Territorial legislation, do not interfere with it. The Southern Senators, who explained their views yesterday, held that his amendment was really nominal, did not change, and was not intended to change, the nature of the Bill. All concurred in repudiating the doctrine of "Squatter Sovereignty," or the right of the People of a Territory to legislate as they please, and in denying that the Bill recognized or gave countenance to, any such doctrine.

As we said once before, what care the slaveholders for the old Slave Code of Louisiana—uncertain and indefinite at the best—whether it be revived or not by the act of repeal, so long as they believe their claims with the Constitution of the United States? This is their Slave Code, as they boast, and so long as they have the majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court on their side, and are masters of the Administration that constitutes the Territorial Courts, they can make good their boasts. Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, frankly expresses the opinion that "the Territorial Legislature will take no action on the subject of Slavery, and will leave to American citizens residing in the Territory, to act as they please in regard to the introduction of slaves;" but that "should a measure be made as to the freedom of a slave, and he should demand his freedom, on the ground that he was free under a Territorial Law, the answer of the master would be, that he held the slave as property under a higher law than the enactment of a Territorial Legislature—under the great, fundamental law of the country."

"We conceive," says the *South Side* (Va.) Democrat, "that the thirty-five Senators who recorded their names in its favor (Badger's amendment) commit themselves to the Constitution, that, by virtue of the Constitution, every citizen of the Union has a right to remove to any part of the Territory, and to carry his property with him, and that it is the duty of the Territorial Legislature, whether that property be persons or things."

"With the Democrats," we contend," says the *Richmond* (Va.) *Enquirer*, "that Slavery exists in the national territories in virtue of the Constitution."

The Washington *Sentinel* thinks the wise men of the Senate knew what they were about, and that Badger's amendment ought to disturb no Southern man's nerves.

"Under the Constitution," it says "there is a theoretical existence of Slavery in all the acquired territory—that is, any man can carry his slaves into it. This is the view of the amendment in question. There is no need of reviving the old French law. There is no power in Congress to legislate in regard to it, either the one way or the other. We reserve to one can seriously believe that Mr. Badger's amendment will have the effect of preventing a master from carrying his slaves into Nebraska and Kansas. The objection to it is, in order to be valid, must show that it either abolishes Slavery in that Territory, or inhibits its going there, or that it interferes in some way against it. To our mind it has no such operation. On the contrary, we regard it, taken in connection with the rest of the bill, as the most complete assertion that we can conceive of the doctrine of non-intervention. If we had one doubt or misgiving in regard to it, we should instantly denounce it."

"The right of the master to carry his slave within the Territory is just as complete within the existence of the old French law as within it. Even if Senator Badger's amendment had not been adopted, the master, in introducing his slave property within the Territory, would not rely for its protection and security upon

the provisions of the old French law, but upon the operative force of the Constitution. The old French law affords no protection to his property which the Constitution itself does not give. His rights are equal, and are the same with or without that law. If the master relies upon the local law for his right to the labor and service of his slave, it may become a very serious question whether, in the absence of constitutional protection, the local authorities of the Territories could not repeal or alter that law. It is far better for the Southern master to have the right to the service of his slave should be protected by the operation of the Constitution than by the force of any local law."

In another part of the article from which this extract is taken, the editor holds, that "when we acquire territory, it comes instantly under the operation of the Constitution of the United States"—that all laws inconsistent with the Constitution are immediately annulled—that laws prohibiting Slavery, being thus inconsistent, become at once void—and that laws recognizing, and providing for, Slavery, being "consistent with the Constitution, are protected fully and completely so long as such territory remains in the condition of a public land."

The *Richmond* (Va.) *Whig* says, "We have never entertained the idea that the object of this amendment was to lay any restriction upon the introduction of slaves into the Nebraska Territory."

"We care not," it continues, "whether the Bill revives or repeals the old French law, in favor of 1820, recognizing or establishing Slavery in that Territory. Without a positive restriction, such as that enacted under the Missouri Compromise, the introduction of slaves is permitted in the Territory. The Constitution of the United States will recognize its existence, and that is all the South need ask for. Let the prohibition be removed, and then Southern citizens can emigrate to the country with their slaves, and the chance of their admission into the Union as slave or non-slaveholding States. This privilege they have a right to, and in the absence of any special prohibitory enactment by Congress, it is guaranteed to them by the Federal Constitution. Slaves are recognized as property by the Constitution, and those holding them are as much entitled to their possession in the public territory as they are to any other species of property."

These quotations show the prevailing opinion among slaveholders. They will not hazard a cautious gain for Slavery upon a mere abstraction. Let no opponent of the Bill hope for its defeat through disingenuous aims; and let not the Northern people be duped, by this clamor against Badger's amendment, into the notion that it is any concession to the North. The extracts we have submitted exclude any such idea.

In view of these pro-Slavery dogmas concerning the Constitution, universally maintained by slaveholders, boldly promulgated by them, the opponents of the Bill in the Senate ought to obtain an expression of opinion in favor of the right of the People of a Territory, through their Territorial Legislature, to exclude Slavery. The slaveholders openly denied the existence of any such right, and their cherished dogma, that the Constitution theoretically recognizes the existence of Slavery in all Territory of the Union, and protects it when actually existing there, involves necessarily the denial of any such right.

And yet they all arrayed themselves in support of the Bill, which professes to confer upon the People of a Territory the right to form their own institutions! Why? Because of the qualifying clause, "subject to the Constitution of the United States"—a qualification with very different meanings in the two sections of the Union—being construed by the slaveholding supporters of the Bill to exclude all Territorial legislation against Slavery, while by their Northern advocates it is innocently asked, "Has the Territorial Legislature the right to legislate against the Constitution of the United States?"

Deliberately, through design, this Bill is invested with two faces, so framed as to admit of two interpretations; and the majority that passed it through the Senate, knowing this to be a fact, to a man voted down an amendment which would have given it one face, one voice, one meaning—that amendment was, one voice, under the Constitution of the United States, to which the legislation of the Territory was to be subject, the Territorial Legislature would have the right to exclude Slavery. The slaveholders voted against this, because they deny such a right to the Northern supporters of the Bill voted against it, leaving us in doubt whether they believe in the existence of such a right or not; but the vote, as a whole, was a complete denial of its existence. And yet, the Northern advocates of the Bill are shameless enough, in full view of this vote, to claim Northern support for the Bill, on the ground that it recognizes the right of the People of a Territory to form their own institutions, and to exclude Slavery. On this *Lie*, the supporters of the Bill in the Northern States rest their whole argument.

THE NEBRASKA-KANSAS BILL IN THE HOUSE.

AN IMPORTANT VOTE.

The vote of yesterday, by which the Nebraska-Kansas Bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, is important, but not decisive. Mr. Richardson, Chairman of the Committee on Territories, who assumed the management of the bill, with more readiness than discretion, saw proper to make the deposition of the measure a test question. If referred to the Committee on Territories, he said, it could be reported back, and, if a majority were in favor of it, after necessary amendments, it would be put upon its passage. That is, the Committee on Territories, a majority of which is in favor of the bill, might strike out the alien clause; at a moment's pleasure, and when all the friends of the measure should be prepared, report it back to the House; when the very able and vigilant Speaker could assign the floor to the Chairman of said Committee; by whom the previous question would be demanded; and the question of the bill would be brought to a direct vote upon the bill, without opportunity for consideration or discussion.

This, Mr. Richardson wished was the disposition of the bill which a single desire for its passage required—this was the policy of its real friends.

The other mode proposed was, to refer it to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. That, Mr. Richardson declared, would be "killing it by indirection. It was useless to disguise the fact; the Nebraska-Kansas bill already reported from the Committee on Territories of the House, and referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, was the twentieth on the calendar. Gentlemen need not pretend to him that they were favorable to the measure, when they were willing to place it in a position where it could not be reached again during the session. The effort to refer the bill was an endeavor to defeat it altogether."

There can be no doubt that Mr. Richardson gave utterance to the views of the great majority of the determined supporters of the Bill, and it is a fair inference that every one of the ninety-five members who voted with him against the reference to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, not only in favor of its passage, and intends to vote for it, but was willing to see it forced through the House without allowing its opponents time to consider, discuss, or amend it.

Their names are as follows:

NAYS.—Messrs. Abernethy, Aiken, James C. Allen, Willis Allen, Asa, Thos. B. Bayly, Barkdale, Beecher, Boyce, Breckinridge, Brooks, Caruthers, Caskie, Chastain, Churchill, Clark, Clingman, Cobb, Colquhoun, Cox, Craig, C. Davis, Dawson, Deas, Disney, Dowdell, Dunbar, Elliott, Engle, Ewing, Faulkner, Florence, Gooden, Greenwood, Hendricks, H. W. Harris, Wiley P. Harris, Henderson, Hens, Hibbard, Hill, Houston, Ingalls, G. W. Jones, J. G. Jones, Roland Jones, Keith, Kerr, Kidwell, Kurtz, Latham, Leitcher, Lindley, MacQuinn, McDougal, McMillen, McNair, McQueen, Maxwell, John G. Miller, Smith Miller, Mills, Olds, Morehead, Oliver, Orr, Packer, John Parkins, Phelps, Phillips, Powell, Preston, Ready, Reese, Richardson, Riddle, Robbins, Rogers, Ruffin, Samuel, Shannon, Shaw, Showers, Singleton, Samuel A. Smith, Wm. Smith, Wm. R. Smith, Geo. W. Smith, Frederick P. Stenton, Vannoy, Walsh, Warren, Daniel B. Wright, H. B. Wright, and Zollieffer—95.

From the Slave States, 72, from the Free States, 24. These twenty-four are—

MACDONALD, of Maine, Ohio, of Ohio.

HIBBARD, of Ohio, DIXON, of Ohio.

WALSH, of New York, J. G. DAVIS, of Ind.

PACKER, of Pa. ENGLISH, of Ind.

WRIGHT, do. MILLER, do.

KURTZ, do. HENDRICKS, do.

HAWES, of Pa. ALLEN, of Illinois.

MCNAIR, do. RICHARDSON, do.

FLORENCE, do. HENK, of Iowa.

ROBBINS, do. LATHAM, of California.

CLARK, of Michigan. McDONALD, do.

All, so-called Democrats—being 3 from New England, 1 from New York, 7 from Pennsylvania, 1 from Michigan, 3 from Ohio, 4 from Indiana, 2 from Illinois, 1 from Iowa, 2 from California.

From the vote given by these twenty-four gentlemen, we understand, and their constituents will understand, that they not only intend to vote for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, but that they were anxious to aid Mr. Richardson in forcing through the Bill, without opportunity being allowed for free discussion. Doubtless they have made up their minds to meet the full responsibility of their course of action, and are willing to submit it to the judgment of their constituents.

Some States were absent, or dodged a vote on this question. These were—

CONNING, of N. York, DAVIS, Pennsylvania.

WALKER, do. HOWE, do.

ROWE, do. D. STUART, Michigan.

DEAN, do. STRATTON, N. Jersey.

TWEN, do. LINDLEY, of Ohio.

MCALLOCH, of Pa. DUNHAM, of Indiana.

BRIDGES, do. COOK, of Iowa.

JONES, do. COOK, of Iowa.

Some of these were unintentionally absent; some, we fear, intentionally. Many friends of Mr. Deas, a prominent "Soft" from New York, would have been glad to see his vote recorded.

Those voting to refer the Bill to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, were as follows:

YALE, of Conn., Appleton, Ball, Banks, Belcher, Bennett, Benson, Benton, Bissell, Bliss, Bugg, Campbell, Carpenter, Chamberlain, Chandler, Chase, Corwin, Crocker, Culom, Curtis, Cutting, Thomas Davis, Dick, Dick, Dinkins, Noble, North, Oliver, Perkins, Parker, Pratt, Pringle, Russell, David Ritchie, Thomas Ritchie, Purcell, Sabin, Sage, Seymour, Simmons, Sisson, Gerrit Smith, Smith, H. Stanton, Hester, J. Stevens, Straub, Andrew Stuart, John J. Taylor, John A. Taylor, Thurston, Tracy, Trout, Upham, Val, Wade, Walbridge, Walcutt, Elhu B. Washburne, H. Washburne, John W. Wentworth, J. Wentworth, Westbrook, Wheeler, Witte, and Yates—110.

We said the vote on the reference was important, though not decisive—important, as showing how many and who were willing to support the Bill at all hazards, and put it through in hot haste—not decisive, because some voted to refer it to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, who would not be depended upon to vote against the Bill on the question of its passage.

Of these, some may be willing to get rid of the measure, some may be willing to be subject to the hands of their political foes, while others may desire to amend the Bill so that they can vote for it consistently. That the great majority of those voting for this reference are unfriendly to the Bill, there can be no doubt, and the spirit, firmness, and discretion, which they exhibited in this preliminary struggle yesterday, are full of encouragement to the friends of justice and good faith.

But they must not relax their vigilance or lay down their arms. The struggle has only commenced. They have obtained an advantage, but not a triumph. A change of only eight votes would have thrown the day against them. That a majority of but fourteen could be secured, is a result, designed to force through without deliberation a measure of such magnitude, and in opposition to which the free States are almost unanimously arrayed, must show them that any remissness on their part may prove fatal. Let them remember, that some of the eight Southern men who on this occasion voted with the majority, from the conviction that to disturb the Missouri Compromise was, if not a violation of good faith, at least pregnant with ultimate mischief to the South, may yet be forced into a false position; that of the eight Southern men who were absent, every one, if present, would probably have voted for referring the Bill to the Committee on Territories; that Mr. Cutting, speaking in behalf of the bill, spoke of the "Fathers on the right," and that his object in moving its reference to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union was to amend it in its details, so as to bring it in strict conformity to those principles. Add to these considerations, that the Administration is now openly committed to the measure, openly pledged by its "organ" to use all its power to insure its passage through Congress, and the People must see that nothing but the most urgent and potential demonstrations of their opinion and will can avert this catastrophe.

HOW IT WILL WORK—A GLANCE AT THE FUTURE.

Let us suppose that the anti alien clause of the Nebraska Bill having been stricken out, the measure has passed both Houses of Congress, received the sanction of the President, and become a law.

Now, says the slaveholder, we shall have peace. There will be no more Congressional intermeddling with Slavery. The vexed question is solved. The effort to refer the bill was an endeavor to defeat it altogether."

There can be no doubt that Mr. Richardson gave utterance to the views of the great majority of the determined supporters of the Bill, and it is a fair inference that every one of the ninety-five members who voted with him against the reference to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, not only in favor of its passage, and intends to vote for it, but was willing to see it forced through the House without allowing its opponents time to consider, discuss, or amend it.

you to qualify or limit its legitimate consequences.

First, then, we demand the repeal of the act of Congress of 1801-2, by which the slave code of Maryland was re-enacted in this District. Slavery here rests upon that code; that code rests upon a special act of Congress; that act is inconsistent with the question of Slavery, and the principle of Non-Intervention requires its repeal. This demand we shall continue to urge, and you shall have no peace till it be complied with.

Secondly, The Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 is a clear violation of the principle. To the States and to the Territories you have referred the entire question of Slavery; we now agree in this reference. To say the least, the question whether Congress has the power to legislate for the reclamation of fugitive slaves, is just as doubtful as the question whether it has the right to legislate for Territories. You take the ground of strict construction in the latter case; we take the same ground in the former; and, as you have established the principle that Congress ought not to interfere in any form in regard to Slavery, we insist upon its application in the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, a most odious act of Congressional intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Intervention. Let the States and the Territories regulate the matter of escaping slaves for themselves. Are they not quite as capable of acting wisely in the premises as Congress? How dare you array yourselves against Popular Sovereignty and State Rights? You are anxious to exclude agitation from the halls of Congress; but this cannot be done, so long as Congress shall persist in violating the principle of Non-Int